

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD  
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES

INGREDION, INC. d/b/a PENFORD PRODUCTS  
CO.

and

BAKERY, CONFECTIONARY, TOBACCO  
WORKERS & GRAIN MILLERS LOCAL 100G

Case 18-CA-209797

**GENERAL COUNSEL'S OPPOSITION TO  
RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO AMEND ANSWER**

Counsel for the General Counsel (Counsel) respectfully requests that the Administrative Law Judge deny Respondent's Motion to Amend its answer in Case 18-CA-209797. Specifically, in support of this Motion, Counsel avers:

Respondent's Motion to Amend Respondent's Answer to Consolidated Complaint should be denied. The motion is both inexcusably untimely and raises no new issue of material fact warranting a hearing.

As an initial matter, Respondent's effort to inject a new affirmative defense into this case mid-hearing is unexplained. Nothing about this case has changed since the Respondent initially filed its answer, aside from Respondent's evident discovery of a theoretical defense which—although easily available to it given that the issue has been under active debate in the federal courts for several years—it neglected to consider.<sup>1</sup> There is no good cause for permitting such an amendment.

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., *Bebo v. SEC*, 799 F.3d 765 (7th Cir. 2015) (rejecting similar argument as a collateral attack over which the court had no jurisdiction); *Bandimere v. SEC*, 844 F.3d 1168 (10th Cir.

Moreover, such an amendment would be futile, as Respondent's defense would properly be summarily adjudicated against it in any event. The Board itself appoints administrative law judges, and has always done so. The Board is a "Head of Department."<sup>2</sup> And the Board is expressly authorized by Congress to appoint administrative law judges. See 5 U.S.C. § 3105 ("Each agency shall appoint as many administrative law judges as are necessary for proceedings required to be conducted in accordance with sections 556 and 557 of this title"); 29 U.S.C. § 154(a) ("The Board shall appoint an executive secretary, and such attorneys, examiners, and regional directors, and such other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties.").<sup>3</sup> This procedure fully satisfies the requirements of the Appointments Clause.

Finally, to the extent that Respondent seeks to turn this case into a fishing expedition into the Board's appointment practices, Board law is clear that such fishing expeditions are impermissible:

---

2016) (accepting materially identical argument as to SEC judges because such judges were not appointed by the agency head).

<sup>2</sup> *Free Enterprise Fund v. Public Company Accounting Oversight Bd.*, 561 U.S. 477, 511–513 (2010) ("Head of Department" means a freestanding component of the Executive Branch, not subordinate to or contained within another component), and *cf. Lucia v. SEC*, 582 U.S. \_\_\_, 2018 WL 3057893, at \*4 (June 21, 2018) ("the Commission itself counts as a "Head[ ] of Department[ ]").

<sup>3</sup> In 1947, the term "examiner" or "trial examiner" in the NLRA referred to what are now referred to as administrative law judges. Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, Pub. L. No. 79-101, Title I, 61 Stat. 136, 139, 140, 147. In 1978, Congress codified the shift to the term "administrative law judge," specifying that any law that used the term "hearing examiner" as appointed under Section 3105 of the Administrative Procedure Act shall be deemed to be a reference to an "administrative law judge." Pub. L. No. 95-251, § 3, 92 Stat. 183, 184 (1978). Due to an apparent codification error, although the US Code version of the NLRA duly replaced six instances of the terms "examiner" and "trial examiner" with "administrative law judge" in Sections 3(d), 4(a) and 10(c) of the Act, 29 U.S.C. § 153(d), 154(a), 160(c), a single instance of the term "examiner" in 29 U.S.C. § 154(a) was not updated to read "administrative law judge." This is of no consequence, because it is well settled that errors or stylistic changes made as a result of recodification of the law have no substantive effect. See, e.g., *Fla. Agency for Healthcare Development v. Bayou Shores SNF, LLC (In re Bayou Shores SNF, LLC)*, 828 F.3d 1297, 1314 (11th Cir. 2016).

A defense should also be stricken if it is interposed to engage in a “fishing expedition” to discover evidence needed to support the defense. See *Flaum Appetizing Corp.*, 357 NLRB 2006, 2010–2011 (2011) (striking the employer’s affirmative defenses in the backpay proceeding asserting that the discriminatees were undocumented aliens, as the employer failed, in response to motion for particulars, to articulate any factual support, or reason to believe it could obtain such factual support, for the defenses), and cases cited therein.

NLRB Administrative Law Judges Bench Book, § 3-550. Accordingly,

Respondent’s motion should be denied.

Dated: July 9, 2018

\_\_\_\_/s/ Chinyere C. Ohaeri

Chinyere C. Ohaeri  
National Labor Relations Board  
Eighteenth Region  
Federal Office Building  
212 3rd Ave S, Ste 200  
Minneapolis, MN 55401  
Telephone: (952) 703-2886  
Facsimile: (612) 348-1785  
E-mail: chinyere.ohaeri@nlrb.gov

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing Opposition was served on the parties via electronic mail at the email addresses listed below, and was filed using the Board's e-filing system:

### **Respondent:**

STUART R. BUTTRICK, ATTORNEY  
FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP  
300 N MERIDIAN ST, SUITE 2700  
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204  
Stuart.Buttrick@faegreBD.com

RYAN J. FUNK, ATTORNEY  
FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP  
300 NORTH MERIDIAN STREET, SUITE 2700  
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-1750  
Ryan.Funk@faegreBD.com

### **Charging Party:**

MATTHEW J. PETRZELKA, ESQ., ATTORNEY  
PETRZELKA & BREITBACH, P.L.C.  
1000 42ND ST SE STE A  
CEDAR RAPIDS, IA 52403-3987  
mpetrzelka@petrzelkabreitbach.com

**Dated:** July 9, 2018

/s/ Chinyere Ohaeri

Chinyere C. Ohaeri  
National Labor Relations Board  
Eighteenth Region  
Federal Office Building  
212 3rd Ave S, Ste 200  
Minneapolis, MN 55401  
Telephone: (952) 703-2886  
Facsimile: (612) 348-1785  
E-mail: chinyere.ohaeri@nllrb.gov